

# Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain & Ireland

<http://journals.cambridge.org/JRA>

Additional services for *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain & Ireland*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



---

## Notes on the Text. Column II.

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain & Ireland / Volume 10 / July 1847, pp xlvii - liii

DOI: 10.1017/S0035869X00015550, Published online: 14 March 2011

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0035869X00015550](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0035869X00015550)

### How to cite this article:

(1847). Notes on the Text. Column II.. Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain & Ireland, 10, pp xlvii-liii  
doi:10.1017/S0035869X00015550

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

means of restoring the verb of which we see the termination *áyam* in the succeeding line, but there cannot be much doubt as to its signification.

Line 92.—Here is a blank space on the rock between the characters  $\text{𐎶𐎶𐎶}$  and  $\text{𐎶𐎶}$  in the name of 'Ufrátuwá, which I have neglected to shew in the text, but which appears never to have been lettered. From the letter  $\text{𐎶𐎶}$  to the end of the line is entirely lost, but the context furnishes a certain restoration.

Line 93.—The seven characters which intervene between  $\text{𐎶𐎶𐎶}$  and  $\text{𐎶𐎶𐎶𐎶}$  on the right hand of the line, are altogether lost; but I have no hesitation in restoring *mam . hamar(a)nam*.

Line 95.—In the imperfect word succeeding *apiyá*, there appears to have been one letter before  $\text{𐎶𐎶}$ , and two between that character and  $\text{𐎶𐎶}$ ; I have no clue however to their restoration.

Line 96.—The restorations to this line require no remark except in reference to the final word of the column, which is given on the authority of line 94; *Akhumá* also occurs twice in the 12th paragraph of the 2nd column; and in line 17 of the inscription of Persepolis, completed by Westergaard<sup>1</sup>.

The lower part of the 1st column is throughout more or less injured, and in the right hand corner the writing is in many part entirely obliterated by the abrasion of the surface of the rock.

## COLUMN II.

A fissure varying in breadth, which has been caused by the percolation of water from above, bisects the second column, and destroys the continuity of the writing throughout its whole extent. Fortunately, however, the construction is so extremely simple and uniform, that the lost portions of the inscriptions may be restored with a very high degree of probability; and from line 29, we have also the Median transcript which is perfect, to verify and assist in the recovery.

In lines 1 and 2, the restorations appear to me to be unexceptionable.

In line 3, there is a difficulty. The termination in *dha* which is perfect, as well as the context, would suggest the restoration of *washná . A'uramazdáha*; but after the completion of the word *ashiyawam*, the broken space is alone sufficient for the intervention of 5 or 6 letters,

<sup>1</sup> See Lassen's Zeitschrift, page 172. I have also been obligingly favoured by Mr. Westergaard with a MS. copy of this inscription.

and the usual phrase therefore cannot have been introduced at length. Either the word *washná* must have been accidentally omitted by the artist, or the construction must be different from that which is usually employed. I have thought it best accordingly to leave the space entirely blank.

Line 4.—The restoration of *agarbáyam* may be questioned, the repetition of the verb appearing to be unnecessary. We have an instance, however, of the same redundant expression in paragraph 7 of the 3rd column, and the final  $\text{𐎶𐎶}$  is partially visible.

Line 7.—I restore the name of *Arm'ina*, between *Athurá* and *Parthwa*, as the Armenians appear to have been conjoined with the Assyrians in their revolt. The expeditions indeed of *Dadarshish* and *Wum'isa*, which occupy five paragraphs of this column, are especially referred to Armenia, while Assyria is merely mentioned incidentally, as the country in which *Wum'isa* fought his first battle. The restoration of  $\text{𐎶𐎶} \text{𐎶𐎶} \text{𐎶𐎶}$  in *Parthwa* is hardly, I think, open to objection.

Line 8.—Remark the orthography of *Saka* instead of *Saká*, as the name is uniformly written at Persepolis<sup>1</sup>. Perhaps I have been too bold in restoring  $\text{𐎶𐎶} \text{𐎶𐎶} \text{𐎶𐎶} \text{𐎶𐎶}$ , for the double employment of *martiya* both as a generic term and a proper name in immediate contiguity has an unpleasing effect; but on the other hand, the final  $\text{𐎶𐎶}$  which is quite distinct, would appear to indicate that this circumstance had produced no change in the construction which is observed in all the other paragraphs.

Line 9.—*Pársiya* is restored on the authority of line 16, column 4th; where in the recapitulation of the victories of Darius, *Martiya* is expressly mentioned as a Persian.

Line 10.—The name which I read '*Umanish*' occurs in three passages, but unfortunately in every instance, the initial character is doubtful. In this line, and line 16, column 4th, the letter has the appearance of  $\text{𐎶}$  or  $\text{𐎶}$ , but in line 4 of the detached inscription F, the sign  $\text{𐎶}$  may, I think, be traced at the commencement of the name, and I consider therefore the doubtful character to be 'u,  $\text{𐎶}$ . I must add at the same time, that the Median transcript appears to give the orthography of *Amanish* as if the initial letter were  $\text{𐎶}$ .

Line 11.—The word of which the termination in  $\text{𐎶𐎶} \text{𐎶𐎶}$  is visible

<sup>1</sup> See Lassen's Zeitschrift, page 176, Inscip I., line 18; and page 178, Ins. N. R., lines 25 and 28.

on the right of the fissure is probably *adakiya*, (See line 24 and also paragraph 18 of column 4th,) but the letters  $\overline{\text{𐎠𐎡}}$   $\overline{\text{𐎠}}$  are entirely lost, and the sense is so obscure, that I have hesitated to give the restoration in the text. There is also sufficient space for two or three letters on the rock, between the word *k'hsháyathiya* and the conjectural restoration of *adakiya*, which I am quite unable to fill up.

Line 12.—I cannot venture to restore the word that follows *hachdama*; there is space for about seven letters which are entirely lost. I give the orthography of 'Uwajiyá instead of 'Uwajhiyá, on the authority of line 76, column 1st, where the character  $\times\langle\Xi$  is found to replace the usual  $\times\langle$  in the nominative plural of this ethnic title<sup>1</sup>; in line 10, column 4, the singular of the ethnic title retains  $\times\langle$ .

Line 13.—The vacant space in this line may perhaps contain the words *utáshim.awájhana*, but it would be too bold to introduce them in the text. The broken space beyond the character  $\Sigma\langle$ , which is quite distinct, appears to have been never lettered.

Line 14 and 15.—The context in these lines, I think, fully supports the restorations.

Line 16.—In my rough copy I have added  $\overline{\text{𐎠𐎡}}$  to the genitival inflexion of 'Uwak'hshatara, and I have omitted the character at the end of *tu'máya*. The omission I am persuaded is an error, for the orthography of *tu'máyá* is constant and uniform, but the addition is subject to doubt. In column 4, lines 19 and 22, and in the detached inscriptions E, line 7, and G, line 9, the inflexion is in *hya* without the final  $\overline{\text{𐎠𐎡}}$ ; but in line 81 of the present column, I observe the name to be again written 'Uwak'hshatarahyá in the rough copy. Having neglected to pay particular attention to this orthographical irregularity on the spot, I have placed the character in a parenthesis. There is perhaps hardly sufficient authority for the restoration of the words *vāthápatiya . áha*; I have been guided by the apparent similarity of construction in paragraphs 5 and 6 of the 3rd column, where the word occurs at length in line 26; but I admit at the same time that the parallel is not altogether satisfactory. I may here remark that the orthography of  $\overline{\text{𐎠𐎡}}$   $\times\langle$  is always employed at Behistun, for the word which is written *vitha*, at Persepolis.

Line 18.—The interval in this line being sufficient for fifteen letters, I am justified, I think, in restoring *Pársa . utá . Máda.*, as in

<sup>1</sup> See also line 6 of the 5th column.

paragraph 6th of the 3rd column, in preference to introducing a single name.

Line 19.—For the name of *Vidarna* see line 21.

Line 22.—The name of the Median city where the action took place is entirely lost, with the exception of the initial >𐎶𐎶. It appears to have contained eight letters.

Line 23.—I have conjecturally restored *hadá* before *Má*, and *dayibish* . *hya* after it.

Line 24.—I was unable to trace a single letter in the broken spaces which disfigure this line; and as the matter contained in it is out of the usual routine of description, I cannot restore the writing even conjecturally. The first interval contains five letters, and the latter eight.

Line 26.—The numerals 𐎶𐎶𐎶 are a good deal mutilated, but I believe I have given them correctly.

Lines 27 and 28.—The restorations are given on the authority of the concluding phrases in paragraphs 9 and 11 of this column, where the construction is nearly similar. For the restoration of *mám* . *káma*, as an equivalent to the *chitá* . *mám* of the other paragraphs, see lines 35 and 36 of column 4th, and lines 37 and 38 of the long inscription of Nakhsh-i-Rustam<sup>1</sup>.

Line 30.—Remark another instance of the indifferent employment of 𐎶𐎶 and 𐎶𐎶; in this line and in line 50 of the present column, the word *pṛitiya* is written 𐎶𐎶 𐎶𐎶 𐎶𐎶 𐎶𐎶 𐎶𐎶, the letter 𐎶𐎶 being perfectly distinct, while in line 14 of column 3rd, the orthography is employed of 𐎶𐎶 𐎶𐎶 𐎶𐎶 𐎶𐎶 𐎶𐎶.

Line 33.—The name of the place where Dadarshish fought his first action is entirely lost, and I hesitate to restore the orthography on the mere faith of the Median copy. The space appears to be sufficient for six letters.

Line 34.—Remark the orthography of *Armaniyiya*: In the present passage and in line 39 and 44 I have particularly noticed, in my rough copy, the substitution of >𐎶𐎶 for 𐎶𐎶𐎶; but in line 59 I have preserved the old spelling without comment, probably, as I think, through an oversight. In line 41, the name of *Thurawáharahya* is restored from the Median. As far as line 43, I observe nothing else requiring particular notice in the restorations, or other parts of the text.

Line 44.—The name of the fort near which Dadarshish fought his

<sup>1</sup> See Lassen's *Zeitschrift*, page 173.

third action is altogether obliterated, and the pronunciation of the word is doubtful even in the Median.

Line 48.—I cannot venture to restore the name which is lost in this line, for the Median copy gives a very doubtful orthography. The word *yátá* is partially visible, and may be given with certainty, on the authority of the Median. For the construction, see the concluding phrases in paragraphs 6 and 11 of this column.

Line 53.—The letter 𐭥 is doubtful; the name appears to have consisted of five characters, but it is quite illegible, and I am not sure of the Median orthography.

Line 59.—I find the characters 𐭥 𐭥 𐭥 𐭥 𐭥 in my rough copy, but I entertain a strong suspicion that they are incorrect, and that the true orthography of the word is 𐭥 𐭥 𐭥 𐭥 𐭥 𐭥 𐭥, as it appears in lines 34, 39, and 44.

Line 62.—The 4th character in this line is entirely lost, and the word to which it belongs occurring in no other passage of the inscriptions, I am unable to restore it.

Line 63.—For the restorations, see the preceding lines of this column, 28 and 48.

Line 64.—The characters 𐭥 and 𐭥, are both doubtful in the word *nijháyam*, and I have no means of verification.

Line 65.—The letter on the right hand of the fissure is doubtful; according to the Median copy, the name should commence with *Kh* or *Gh*, and it is very probable therefore that the true form is 𐭥.

Line 69.—The letter 𐭥 in *Frawartish* is partially visible, but the succeeding character is entirely lost. I have restored 𐭥, on the authority of the names of the months *Bágayádish* and *Tháigarchish*, which as masculines in *i*, appear to form the genitive in *ish*. At the same time I must remark, that the space on the rock between the 𐭥 of *Frawartish* and the 𐭥 of *adam*, is sufficient for four letters<sup>1</sup>. The great blank on the right contains the name of a month, which, however, as it occurs in no other passage of the inscriptions, I am unwilling to restore, on the mere faith of the Median orthography. The restoration even of the genitival inflexion in 𐭥 𐭥 may be questioned.

<sup>1</sup> Remark also the form of *Chishpishhyá* in line 8 of the detached Inscription A. Perhaps the true reading of the passage is 𐭥 𐭥 𐭥 𐭥 𐭥 𐭥 𐭥 𐭥 𐭥.

Line 70.—For the restoration of *akhumá* see line 68, and lines 90 and 94 of column 1st.

Line 73.—The letters  $\text{𐎧𐎶𐎵}$   $\text{𐎧𐎶}$   $\text{𐎶}$  in *tyipatiya* are exceedingly doubtful. I was unable indeed to ascertain positively whether the broken space succeeding *fráishayam* contained two or three letters. In *agarbáyatá*, all the characters, with the exception of  $\text{𐎧𐎶𐎵}$ , may be indistinctly traced within the fissure; farther on also the letters  $\text{𐎶𐎵}$   $\text{𐎶𐎵}$  are sufficiently clear, but the characters  $\text{𐎧𐎶}$   $\text{𐎧𐎶𐎵}$  in *utá*, and  $\text{𐎧𐎶}$   $\text{𐎧𐎶}$  in *ánayatá*, are restorations supported by the context, and by a comparison with line 88 of the present column.

Line 74.—For the restoration of the enclitical pronoun *shiya*, see line 88 where the construction is nearly similar. I have noted in my rough copy that nine letters intervene between the  $\text{𐎧𐎶}$  of *utá*, and the final  $\text{𐎧𐎶𐎵}$ , on the right of the fissure; but they are wholly lost, and the particular word, which probably signifies “lips,” is omitted in the succeeding paragraph.

Line 75.—The second letter, almost effaced from the rock, appears to resemble  $\text{𐎧𐎶𐎵}$ , but I have preferred the restoration of  $\text{𐎧𐎶}$ , on the authority of line 89. The next word appears to contain four letters, but neither in this line, nor in line 89, where the term again occurs, can the forms of any of the characters be traced, with the exception of the final  $\text{𐎧𐎶𐎵}$ , in the latter passage. In the following word I have introduced an *n*,  $\text{𐎧𐎶}$ , in my rough copy; but I believe erroneously; for in line 89, I have the orthography of  $\text{𐎶𐎵}$   $\text{𐎧𐎶𐎵}$   $\text{𐎧𐎶}$   $\text{𐎧𐎶𐎵}$ , and on etymological grounds, I am inclined to regard that as the true orthography. I have placed accordingly the character  $\text{𐎧𐎶}$  in a parenthesis. The forms of all the characters in this line, can be traced through the right hand fissure, with the exception of the final  $\text{𐎧𐎶}$ , in *dhuwarayámiya*, and the  $\text{𐎧𐎶𐎵}$  in *adáriya*, which are restored on the authority of lines 89, 90, of the present column.

Line 76.—In the second word of this line there would appear to be sufficient space for two letters, to the right and left of the character  $\text{𐎧𐎶𐎵}$ ; but in line 90, where the word again occurs it cannot consist of more than four letters; in the latter passage also the initial character is  $\text{𐎶𐎵}$ , and I may perhaps therefore be justified in giving that restoration, supposing the verb in both cases to commence with *awa*. The

Median transcript is decisive of the identity of the word in the two passages. The final character in the name of Ecbatana, is blank both in this passage and in line 78, but I think  $\Sigma$  may be restored with tolerable certainty. I have been guided in the restoration of *awadašim . us(a)taṣṣapatiya*, by line 52 of column 3rd, where the construction only differs in the substitution of the plural for the singular enclitical pronoun. The letters *apatiya* are perfectly clear, and the initial  $\langle \overline{\text{w}} \rangle$ , can be indistinctly traced; but the three intermediate characters are entirely lost. I must add that in line 52, column 3rd, where the word occurs at length, it is doubtful whether the 3rd letter be an *m*, or a *t*; in one copy I have  $\text{>}\overline{\text{w}}\overline{\text{w}}$ , in another  $\Sigma\overline{\text{w}}\overline{\text{w}}$ ; I have therefore inserted a note of interrogation in the text.

Line 77.—Remark the final  $\overline{\text{w}}$  in *ahatá*; the employment or suppression of this character appears to have been at the option of the artist. The restoration of  $\text{>}\overline{\text{w}}\Sigma$  in *awiya*, is undoubted; the character is sufficiently visible on the rock.

Line 78.—Nothing is to be seen of the characters  $\Sigma \overline{\text{w}} \text{>} \text{>} \overline{\text{w}}$  in the fracture on the left hand, but the  $\Sigma\overline{\text{w}}\overline{\text{w}}$  in *atara* is partially visible, and the entire restoration is, I think, to be depended on. The last word in the paragraph may be *fráḡhanam*, but the letter  $\text{>}\langle$  is extremely indistinct, and the acceptance in which that word is generally used, hardly applies to the present passage.

Line 79.—The restoration of  $\overline{\text{w}} \Sigma \langle \overline{\text{w}} \rangle \Sigma \text{>} \overline{\text{w}} \overline{\text{w}} \text{>}$ , is given on the authority of the Median transcript, which applies the ethnic title of Sagartian to *Chitratak'hma*.

Line 81.—For remarks on the final  $\overline{\text{w}}$  in 'Uwak'hshatarahyá, see note to line 16 of this column.

Line 82.—For the restoration of  $\Sigma$  in the name of *K'hamaspáda*, see line 85 where that character is perfectly distinct.

Line 84.—I am not quite satisfied of the correctness of *tyam ham'itriyam*, for the construction with a double relative is peculiar, and the space appears to be hardly sufficient for the restored letters. The termination in  $\overline{\text{w}} \overline{\text{w}} \overline{\text{w}} \text{>} \text{>} \overline{\text{w}}$  is however given in my rough copy as undoubted, and I know of no other way of filling up the interval. Remark also the  $\overline{\text{w}}$  in *gubátiya*, which I find in the rough copy to be marked as an irregular orthography, and which I have no doubt, therefore, really exists upon the rock.



Line 88.—In this line the final letter of *Chitratahmam* is a good deal defaced; but as the noun is in the accusative case, it can be no other than >𐎶𐎶. The word *utá* is exceedingly doubtful; in my rough copy I have left a short blank space, as if the broken surface had been never lettered; but the sense appears to require the intervention between the two verbs of the copulative conjunction; I may observe at the same time, that in the Median the conjunction is wanting.

Line 89.—There have been three characters apparently in the blank space preceding the letter, >𐎶𐎶, but they are totally effaced. The following word in my rough copy is written 𐎶𐎶 >𐎶𐎶 >𐎶𐎶 >𐎶𐎶 and that I believe to be the true orthography; I have introduced however the letter >𐎶 in a parenthesis, for the reason explained in the note to line 75.

Line 90.—There appears to be barely sufficient space upon the rock for three letters after the initial 𐎶𐎶 in the word which intervenes between *kára* and *pasdwashim*. See the note to line 76.

Line 91.—The restoration on the left hand is given on the authority of the Median transcript, which employs the same word in this passage, that answers to *uz(a)tayápatiya*, in line 76; the termination also in 𐎶𐎶 >𐎶, which is sufficiently distinct, is a further proof of the identity of the terms.

Line 92.—*Mádiya* is restored from the Median transcript, the final >𐎶, being alone visible on the rock.

Line 93.—The final >𐎶 in *Warkána*, is only partially distinguishable, but the Median orthography is undoubted; *Vāštāspa* is also restored on the authority of the Median transcript, and it would not be difficult to complete the line from the same source.

Line 94.—The name of *Vispāwushtisa*, which is only partially legible, is completed after the Median orthography.

I could not distinguish a single letter in lines 95 and 96, the abrasion of the rock extending over the entire lower surface of the column; the loss however is of less consequence as we have the Median transcript complete and perfectly intelligible.

### COLUMN III.

The greater part of this column is in a very perfect state of preservation, and the text accordingly is almost independent of restoration or remark. As far as line 65, at any rate, a few brief notes will afford all the necessary information.